Why Anglican Orders Are Not Valid

BY

A Paulist Father

THE LIBRARY OF THE
OCT 23 1929
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
120 West 60th Street

Copyright, 1922, by "The Missionary Society of
St. Paul the Apostle in the State
of New York."

262.17
P284w

Why Anglican Orders Are Not Valid

BY A PAULIST FATHER.

IT is sufficiently evident that no good comes directly from controversy. This is true especially of religious controversy. In religious controversy, one comes to feel that the religious element grows smaller and smaller, and the controversial elements grow larger and larger. The outcome seems too often to be a sort of "holy war" which the verbal warriors enjoy. Frequently, the result seems to be the manifestation of an unkind spirit which persists long after the disputed point has faded from the consciousness of the disputants. Persons who indulge in religious controversy are likely to feel that their opponent is a perverse fool or foolishly perverse, and each concludes that the other is intentionally stupid.

The writer of this pamphlet has no interest in controversy. It is not controversial. Anyone who thinks to find in it a word which offends against that aspect of charity which we know as courtesy, will misread wholly the purpose of the writer. What follows is an attempt to state as concisely as

possible, in a bare outline, the reasons why the Catholic Church considers Anglican orders invalid.

It may not be beside the point to say that the writer knows a number of Anglicans whose good faith he respects, and whose honest search for truth he honors. These persons occupy a position which is trying. Their cheerful effort to deal with the insuperable difficulties involved in the "Anglican Position" are ample proof of their entire sincerity. There are persons in the Anglican Church, both clergymen and laymen, who are fully convinced that Anglican clergymen are priests—in the Catholic sense of the word. In other words, they believe that Anglican ministers have power to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to give absolution from sin. Moreover, they think that such clergymen speak with the authority promised by Our Lord to His Apostles and their successors.

The lives of such persons is the best and most immediate demonstration of their devotion to what they believe is truth. In addition to this, they are convinced by what seems to them to be the obvious operation of sacramental grace, that their orders are valid. Some of these persons go even so far as to deplore the fact that they are not in communion with the Apostolic See. Of course, it is only fair to say that the teaching of these men by no means represents the belief of the majority of Anglicans. If one can say that the Anglican

body has an official teaching in the matter, it is that the function of a Christian minister is rather prophetic than priestly.

It is to those who believe that the Anglican clergy are priests—to those clergymen and laymen who hold what are called "advanced" ideas, and are known popularly, or unpopularly, as "High Churchmen"—that the matter of this paper is directed. The writer will be repaid if he succeeds in recalling very simply the point at issue in the matter of the fact that the Catholic Church has declared Anglican orders to be invalid. It has nothing whatever to do with personal feeling. It is not an argument. The writer assumes the good faith of his separated brethren, and desires only to remind them of the mutual benefits which can be derived from the exercise of charity in all our thought.

Some words of Pope Leo XIII. sum up the matter so well, that we cannot do better than to quote them. In the course of His Encyclical on Anglican Orders, the Holy Father says: "It remains for Us to say that even as we have entered upon the elucidation of this grave question in the name of and in the love of the Great Shepherd, in the same We appeal to those who desire and seek with a sincere heart the possession of a hierarchy and of orders. Perhaps until now, aiming at the greater perfection of Christian virtue, and searching more

devoutly the divine Scriptures, and redoubling the fervor of their prayers, they have, nevertheless, hesitated in doubt and anxiety to follow the Voice of Christ, which has so long interiorly admonished them. Now they see clearly whither He, in His goodness, invites them and wills them to come. In returning to His one only fold, they will obtain the blessings which they seek, and the consequent helps to salvation of which He has made the Church the dispenser, and, as it were, the constant guardian and promoter of His Redemption amongst the nations. Then indeed 'they shall draw waters in joy from the fountains of the Saviour,' His wondrous Sacraments whereby His faithful souls have their sins truly remitted, and are restored to the friendship of God, are nourished and strengthened by the Heavenly Bread, and abound with the most powerful aids for their eternal salvation. May the God of Peace, the God of all consolation, in His infinite tenderness, enrich and fill with all these blessings those who truly yearn for them. We wish to direct Our exhortation and Our desires in a special way to those who are ministers of religion in their respective communities. They are men who from their very office take precedence in learning and authority, and who have at heart the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Let them be the first in joyfully submitting to the divine call, and obey it, and furnish a glorious example to

others. Assuredly, with an exceeding great joy their Mother the Church will welcome them, and will cherish with all her love and care those whom the strength of their generous souls has, amid many trials and difficulties, led back to her bosom. Nor could words express the recognition which this devoted courage will win for them from the assemblies of the brethren throughout the Catholic world, or what hope or confidence it will merit for them before Christ as their Judge, or what reward it will obtain from Him in the Heavenly Kingdom! And We Ourselves, in every lawful way, shall continue to promote their reconciliation with the Church in which individuals and masses, as We ardently desire, may find so much for their imitation. In the meantime, by the tender mercy of the Lord our God, We ask and beseech all faithfully to follow in the open path of divine grace and truth."[1]

That a Sacrament was instituted for the purpose of transmitting the power of orders is admitted by Anglicans of the High Church school of thought, although there is some dispute among them as to just what the power is. Also, they differ as to what is essential to the form and matter of the rite; but they are agreed as to its existence. The "Article of Religion" which deals with the question says: "There are two Sacraments ordained

[1] *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII.*, Benziger Brothers, pp. 405, 406.

of Christ Our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly as states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."[2]

It seems difficult for those who believe that the purpose of language is to share thought to interpret these words in any sense which will admit of a "Catholic Interpretation." The High Church Anglicans say that the Articles are not doctrinal statements, at least that they have no binding authority; but here, if anywhere, we find the nearest approximation to an authoritative declaration. If the words have not binding force, at least they serve to show the intention which underlay the administration of the Anglican rite of ordination.

Very briefly, the teaching of the Catholic Church with regard to the Sacraments of Holy Orders is as follows: "A Sacrament of the New Law is a sensible sign, permanently instituted by Christ, for the purpose of signifying and conferring grace; or, more briefly, an efficacious sign of grace, divinely

[2]Article XXV., "Of the Sacraments."

instituted. Now, three things are required for a Sacrament of the New Law: [that it be] a sensible sign, productive of grace, permanently instituted by Christ."[3] This applies to all the Sacraments. That the Church teaches that Orders is a Sacrament is shown by the pronouncement of the Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII., can. 3, Denz.-Bann., 963 (840), where we read: "If anyone say that Order, or sacred Ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ the Lord, or that it is a kind of human invention, thought out by men skilled in ecclesiastical matters, or that it is only a kind of rite for selecting ministers of God's Word and the Sacraments, let him be anathema."

Now any Sacrament has two parts, the matter and the form. The matter is the sensible sign, and the form is the prayer or prayers which state in words the application of the Sacrament to the purpose for which it was instituted.

Regarding the teaching of the Catholic Church in the matter of Order, the quotations given above suffice to show the definiteness of that teaching, and to point out the unvarying doctrine of the Church.

It may be asked what the Church's doctrine concerning the essential constituents of the form and matter are, and to answer that question, a quota-

[3]Tract X., De Sacramentis, *Synopsis Theol. Dogmat.*, by A. Tanquerey; pub., Desclée et Socii.

tion from Tanquerey will best serve our purpose: "In Scripture, no other matter of Order is designated except the imposition of hands. During the first nine centuries, no other matter was used in either Church (Western and Eastern). From the tenth century, tradition of the instruments, that is to say of a chalice and paten for priests, and the tradition of the Book of the Gospels for deacons, has been used in the Latin Church, but not in the Greek Church. From this arises the question what is essential matter. There are three chief opinions: many modern men, after the time of St. Bonaventure, teach that only the imposition of hands is the essential matter of the Sacrament (of Order), saying that the tradition of the instruments is only an ecclesiastical rite, which was introduced in the tenth century for the purpose of designating more clearly the power conferred in ordination. Many Thomists and some others think that the tradition of the instruments only is the essential matter, on account of the authority of the Decree to the Armenians, where it is said: 'The sixth Sacrament is (that) of Order, the matter of which is that (thing) by means of the tradition of which the Order is conferred, just as the priesthood is given by means of the tradition of a chalice with wine, and of a paten with bread.' However, those who do not accept this view answer that here the question concerns itself only with the complete and accessory

matter, which the Holy Father wished to be added to the imposition of hands, already used by the Armenians. Others, with Bellarmine and Lugo, hold that the imposition of hands and the tradition of the instruments are the essential matter. For, the former is required by Sacred Scripture, and the latter is shown to be necessary from the Decree to the Armenians. The conclusion is that the first opinion, relying as it does on historical fact, is much more probable. The second (opinion) now seems hardly probable. The third cannot be admitted unless at the same time the fact is acknowledged that God has left to the Church the power of determining, *in specie,* the matter of the Sacraments which He instituted only *in genere.*"[4]

In Sess. XXIII., can. VI., of the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, we find the statement: "If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine institution instituted, consisting of bishops, priests and ministers; let him be anathema." From this Canon, we see that the Church makes a distinction in the orders of the hierarchy. It consists of bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, the four minor orders, and clerical tonsure. In the ordination of subdeacons, candidates for the minor orders, and those who receive the clerical tonsure, there is no

4A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theol. Dogmat.,* Tract. X., Cap. VII., Art. I.

imposition of hands; consequently, we are not here concerned with these orders, but only with the episcopate, the priesthood and the diaconate. In the Eastern Church, the teaching regarding Orders is that the Imposition of Hands, alone, constitutes the full matter of the Sacrament. The Western Church teaches that in addition to the Imposition of Hands, the delivery of the Instruments also constitutes an important part of the ordination ceremony. Whether the delivery of the Instruments is essential to the validity of Order was long disputed. The safest conclusions seems to be that, while the Imposition of Hands is the essence of the matter of Order, the Church has thought best to insist that the delivery of the Instruments should accompany the Imposition of Hands, in order that the safer part may be followed, and any possibility of doubt be excluded. In addition to the matter of the Sacrament, there is also the form to be considered. This is the prayer or prayers and the other words used at the time of conferring the Sacrament, which state the power which is given. The matter and the form are both equally necessary to the valid susception of Order.

Both matter and form were instituted by Christ, but in the case of the delivery of the Instruments, the Church has deemed it the *"tutior pars"* which must always be followed in the administration of the Sacraments. For this reason, the Church car-

ries out the ceremony of the delivery of the Instruments.[5]

To sum up the matter, we may say that the matter and form of the Sacraments were instituted by Christ, and that where anything has been added in the form, the Church has thought best to add it for the sake of making sure that no shade of doubt may be cast on the integrity of the Sacrament by a failure to state with necessary definiteness of expression the purpose of the Sacrament.

The High Church Anglican position with regard to the matter of Order is that the Imposition of Hands is the essential matter, and the form is thought to be sufficient as it is found in the present Prayer Book.

The first point is that in rejecting the delivery of the Instruments, doubt is cast on the integrity of the rite, since the Catholic Church teaches that the delivery of the Instruments is the "safer part," and the form used at present is not the one which was used for many Anglican Ordinations in the beginning. These points will be mentioned again.

But in addition to the proper matter and form, the Church teaches that the one who is conferring the Sacrament must have a proper intention, that is, he must intend to do what the Church intends to do in the sacrament under consideration. "If any-

[5]See Pohle-Preuss, "The Sacraments," vol. iv., part ii., chapter i., section 2, pp. 62-71.

one say that an intention at least of doing what the Church does, is not required in ministers while they are making and conferring sacraments, let him be anathema."[6]

Intention is defined as an "act by which the will tends freely towards any end." Now the Church has defined the intention necessary for the celebration of any sacrament, saying that it is required that he who celebrates any sacrament must have at least a virtual intention of making the sacrament. This is another way of saying that he who would make any sacrament must intend to do what the Church intends to do in that case. "For the validity of a sacrament a virtual intention in the minister is required and suffices."[7] We see, then, that, according to Catholic teaching, the one who confers a sacrament must have the power to do so. This power involves the possession of valid orders, the jurisdiction which gives one the right to use the orders. The matter and form of the sacrament must be intact, and the minister must intend to do what the Church intends to do.

If the writer is not mistaken, the Anglican teaching, at least that of the High Church party, is that the orders in the Anglican Church at present are the same as those which were in the Church in England before the time known as the Reforma-

[6] Sess. VII., can. ii., Denz-Bann., 854 (735).

[7] A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theol. Dogmat.*, Tract. X., Cap. I., Art. III.

tion. Anglicans of this High Church school believe that there was no change in the essential character of Orders in the English Church after the separation from Rome. Many of these Anglicans quote a statement which asserts that the English Church before and after the Reformation is one and the same Church. They say that whatever may have been the internal intention of the first bishops in the Church of England, these men who gave orders to the post-Reformation Anglican bishops had an adequate official intention, so to call it, that is to say their external intention was to do what the Church had always done, in conferring Anglican orders.

The ground on which the Catholic Church denies the validity of Anglican orders is rather theological than historical. That the Anglican Church has a self-created succession of Anglican orders is not denied by the Church. That there has been a line of men who have been consecrated in conformity with the provisions of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, and that this line of men is unbroken from a time including and succeeding the Reformation is not controverted. The point at issue is this: Did the men who ordained Dr. Matthew Parker have valid orders? Did they intend to convey and confer Catholic Order? Was the matter of the Sacrament that which is required by the Catholic Church? Was the form used, the Catholic form?

Regarding the first question, it must be said that the matter of the orders of Parker's consecrators is shrouded in an impenetrable obscurity. One of the co-consecrators is said to have been ordained priest and consecrated bishop according to the Catholic rite. This, if proved, would not clear up much, for the co-consecrators are not, speaking strictly, the ministers in conferring Order. Even if the consecrator and the co-consecrators were true bishops, they lacked jurisdiction.

Moreover, the question of the matter and form used in the consecration of Dr. Parker gives rise to grave difficulties. However the accessories of the form used in the Catholic Church have varied, the essential form has always been such as to show clearly the direct intention of conferring the order in which the form occurs, and for which it exists. In the case of the form used in the consecration of bishops and the ordination of priests, the order to be conferred has always been mentioned with such specific details, and the powers granted for the performance of the functions proper to the order have been stated so plainly that no doubt has ever existed as to the purpose of the ceremony. Now, in the form used in the post-Reformation Church of England, the form was made vague intentionally in order to hold as many former Catholics as possible, by insisting on the nationalistic character of the Church of England, and at the same time an

effort was made to render the form sufficiently ambiguous and elastic to avoid giving pain to those who were influenced largely by the new doctrines which had been brought from the Continent. The result was that the form used in the Prayer Book of Edward VI. was altered and made less Catholic in the next Prayer Book. Later, mention of the purpose of giving the newly-ordained priest power to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead was omitted. Instead of giving the Instruments which accompany and form a part of the Catholic rite, the bishop of the Church of England delivered a Bible. In the following editions of the Book of Common Prayer, the form was changed still more in order to secure the approval of the Genevan divines who were acquiring more and more power in the administration of affairs in the new Church of England. The form and matter were finally changed so much as to render the validity of the rite very dubious, to say the best of it.

The long controversy which resulted may be summed up thus: "The decision against the validity of these orders (Anglican) rests, not on the historic fact that William Barlow, who consecrated Dr. Matthew Parker, the first Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth, on December 7, 1559, was not a validly consecrated bishop, but on the dogmatic fact that the Edwardine rite of

ordination, drawn up in 1549, had purposely altered the sacramental form of Holy Orders, so as to exclude the intention of bestowing the power of consecration and absolution. This perversion, together with the manifest lack of a proper intention, deprives the rite of its sacramental effect. 'It is clear,' says St. Thomas, 'that if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, the essential sense of the words is destroyed, and consequently the sacrament becomes invalid.'[8] This principle explains the custom existing long before the Leonine decision (practically since 1540) of conditionally reordaining converted Anglican clergymen. The orders conferred under the Edwardine ordinal were declared null and void by Paul VI. as early as 1555."[9]

Father H. Hurter, S.J., sums up the matter thus: "But if even up to our day there was a matter of controversy concerning the validity of Anglican ordinations, the reason was not a doubt concerning the thesis whether the ordinations of heretics are valid, but the very grave doubts concerning the valid ordination of the first bishop, Parker, on whom the ordination of the remaining bishops depends; and concerning the sufficiency of the intention in the ministers of the ordinations: for since they deny both the sacrament of Order itself, the

[8] *Summa Theol.*, III., qu. 60, Art. 8.

[9] Pohle-Preuss, *Dogmat. Theol.*, "The Sacraments," vol. iv., p. 71.

power of sacrificing, and the sacerdotal character, and to this end changed the rite, one can hardly say that in ordaining ministers of the Church, they intended to do that which the Church does. But besides these reasons, there are the gravest doubts regarding the sufficiency of the form used in Anglican ordinations. This form is sufficiently equivocal, after the change which was made in it, that it can be said to designate true sacerdotal power. Whence it comes about, that from the year 1554, the unvarying practice has obtained in the Church of considering the ordinations of these men (Anglicans) as invalid. In our time, Leo XIII. did away with the theoretical controversy very definitely in a Bull concerning the matter, given on the thirteenth of September, 1896, in which, among other things, we read: 'The words which even up to the present time have been considered, speaking generally, by Anglicans as the form proper to the ordination of a priest, namely, "Receive the Holy Ghost," signify very indefinitely the Order of priesthood, or the grace and power of it, which especially is the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord. . . . In the matter of Episcopal consecration, the case is similar . . . with this fundamental lack of form is joined a defect of intention . . . if a rite be changed with the manifest intention, so that another, not received by the Church, may be introduced, and so that that

which the Church does, may be rejected, and which from its institution pertains to the nature of the sacrament, then, obviously, not only is the intention necessary to the sacrament lacking, but more, there is an intention opposed to and repugnant to the sacrament. . . . And so, agreeing with all the decrees of preceding Pontiffs in this very matter, and confirming them fully, and, so to say, renewing them, by Our authority, of Our own accord, with certain knowledge, We pronounce and declare that ordinations according to the Anglican rite have been acts wholly invalid and that they are completely null.'" (Leonis Papae XIII., *Allocutiones, Epistolæ, Constitutiones, Aliaque Acta Præcipua,* vol. vi., "*Apostolicæ Curæ,*" pp. 205, 206, *passim.*)[10]

All of these points may be correlated thus: Anglican orders are derived from Dr. Matthew Parker, who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, on December 7, 1559. Dr. Parker was consecrated by William Barlow, who held the See of St. David's, and by John Hodgkins, a bishop without a See. This ceremony was held at a time and place which are disputed. Assuming that the ceremony was held as stated, and assuming that Barlow was a true bishop (an assumption concerning which it is not too much to say that there is doubt), there is more than grave doubt re-

10H. Hurter, S.J., *Theol. Dogmat. Compend.*, Tom. III., Tract. IX., sec. 564, 4.

garding the integrity of the rite. The Prayer Book of Edward VI. excluded all that pointed to sacrifice. It gave prominence to preaching as the chief function of the Christian minister. The delivery of the Bible instead of the sacrificial vessels is a symbol of the intention which was in the minds of those who framed the rite. The words "Receive the Holy Ghost" are not directed towards the reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost for the ministry of sacrifice and absolution. The fact that the words, "for the office and work of a priest," were added later, argues the fact that those who began to use the new form felt its inadequacy. As the words stand in the first draft, the purpose of the rite is not specified. In addition to this, the Catholic bishops who had apostatized and who took part in Anglican consecrations were not the consecrators. The practice of the Holy See for centuries, beginning with the cases which arose soon after Dr. Parker's consecration, show that at no time has there been any doubt or diversity of practice with regard to the orders received from Parker.

Viewed from another angle, the conclusion of the matter is that at the beginning of the Anglican Schism (1534-1547), the Catholic form of ordination was retained. Orders conveyed at that time were valid. This does not mean that they were licit, because as soon as the English Church broke

away from the Holy See, jurisdiction was lost. When we come to Parker's orders, which mark the second stage in the schism, showing the definite rebellion from the Holy See, we find them so dubious from the lack of intention, as well as form, that the question becomes hopeless. At the instigation of Archbishop Cranmer, who derived his jurisdiction from the Crown, we find that a distinctly new form of ordination was instituted. In this new form, all mention of sacrifice was omitted, and from it were deleted all words which could be taken definitely to state the intention of the bishop to confer Orders in the Catholic sense. The alteration of the form expressed negatively the intention which lay behind it. To elevate the prophetic ministry above sacerdotal functions was the expressed (or external) intention, if words mean anything.[11]

The words of the form used under Cranmer are sufficient proof that those who employed them had no intention of carrying on a line of sacrificing priests. Moreover, the fact that those who served as consecrators, lacked all jurisdiction, makes the matter still more involved, and casts on the orders so conferred an additional obscurity. The reason why the Catholic Church denies the validity of Anglican orders is that in the Anglican consecration of bishops there have been, from the beginning, de-

[11]Concerning the internal or subjective intention, the Church cannot judge.

fects in form and intention which make the susception of Catholic Orders impossible on the part of those ordained according to such a mutilated ordinal. The form at no time designated the *sacerdotium,* or priestly function, and the lack of external intention is evident from the deliberate exaltation of the office of preaching, on the one hand, and the words directly suppressing the words giving priestly power, on the other hand. It may be noted that the form used today in the Anglican Church dates from 1661. This form may be valid, as far as words are concerned, which is another way of saying that a Catholic interpretation may be put on it by one who wills to find it, but as so many Anglican bishops have shown, it is equally patient of an interpretation which is diametrically opposed to the Catholic teaching with regard to Holy Order.

Even were the present form susceptible of a Catholic interpretation, it would not change the facts, because for almost a century prior to the adoption of the present form, the form used was most certainly defective. The result is that when the form promulgated in 1661 came into being, there were no bishops to transmit orders, even supposing that the original Anglican bishops had had them. Furthermore, the judgment of the Catholic Church is that even the present form is so ambiguous as to make it essentially defective. The fact that it is permissible to use an alternative

form, in that part of the Anglican rite where the power to give absolution is said to be conferred, makes it evident that the intention is not clear. Such a variety of interpretations exists in matters essential to the integrity of the sacrament, that one cannot say what is the official teaching of the Anglican Church.

Making all possible allowance for the chaotic condition of the time when the forms were drafted by the post-Reformation English bishops, and taking into consideration the diversity in teaching and practice which has resulted, it is not over-reaching the truth to say that the very confusion which has always existed in the Church of England is sufficient proof of the fact that whatever else Anglican orders may be, they are not Catholic Orders. For Catholics, of course, the matter is settled definitely by Pope Leo's Encyclical.

To urge that the words "for the office and work of a priest" are sufficiently explicit is begging the question. What is the office and work of a priest? Surely a function so important cannot be left to the imagination. To omit the statement of a function so important—a function which underlies the whole conception of the Catholic priesthood—is at least strange. Up to the time of the Reformation, the faith of England was Catholic, and no one would have dreamed of the possibility of leaving out of the Ordinal the words which designate the

power to be received by the candidate for the priesthood. It would seem fair to say, that the omission of the words after the Reformation cannot be accidental; rather, the fact that they were deleted shows plainly that whatever the Reformers intended to do, they did not intend to propagate the old priesthood having the power to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. When the Anglican Church came into being, anchored finally in the harbor of a "National Church" which appeared after the stormy days of Henry's matrimonial tornadoes, it was urgent, if ever it was, to define plainly—so plainly that anyone might see at a distance, without the possibility of error, the functions of the ministers who were to take over the functions and works of the priests of the Catholic Church, which "religion by law established" replaced. To anyone who is looking at the problem in the light of the history of the time, it is evident at once that if the Church of England were "the same Church as it was before the Reformation," the officials of the new body would have been careful to state exactly the functions of their chief governors, the Anglican bishops, under the King (or Queen).

The Catholic Church has always been meticulously careful to define precisely, and with a nicety of language calculated to be plain to the simplest as well as to the learned man, the essential parts of every sacrament, its matter and form, the purpose

of its institution, and the graces to be obtained from its use. This is not the case with the Anglican Ordinal at any stage in its development. The Catholic Church teaches that in the administration of any sacrament nothing can be left to the imagination. The purpose of the sacrament must be stated so clearly as to avoid the remotest possibility of doubt or misunderstanding. This is not the case with the Anglican Ordinal.

Over and beyond the points both theological and historical, there is the less easily defined matter of "practice." In a question so vital as the existence or non-existence of Orders, no diversity of opinions is possible. Yet in the Anglican Church we find from the beginning that those who regard the matter of Orders are far from being agreed in defining the power and functions of those ordained in the Anglican Church. The fact that there can be in the same church men who differ radically and fundamentally not in matters of opinion, but in questions of faith so great as whether there is a priesthood in the Anglican Church, or only an "Evangelical" ministry, shows that the intention is vague in the minds of those who are affected by it.

The reader may not agree with the position of the Catholic Church. That is his privilege. But it must be said that the reasons for the denial of the validity of Anglican orders are clear: the lack of the proper form in the Anglican Ordinal; the

defect of intention (external) on the part of Anglican bishops; the absence of jurisdiction in the whole Anglican body.

It seems hard to think that anyone who examines the question with an open mind can reach a conclusion different from that of the Holy Father. To the charity of the reader these considerations are committed. The writer has only one purpose: "That they all may be one."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE short list of books given here is chosen with an eye to enabling the reader to find references readily where the subject is treated in detail, and with more elaboration than is possible or desirable in such a bare outline as is found above.

The Sacraments, by Pohle-Preuss, vol. iv. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology, by S. Hunter, S.J., vol. iii., pp. 381, *et seq.* (This valuable work is out of print.)

The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. i., pp. 491-498.

Salve Mater, by F. J. Kinsman, pp. 152-183. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The Price of Unity, by B. W. Maturin, *passim.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Bishop Gore's Roman Catholic Claims, by Dom Chapman, O.S.B. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The Path to Rome, by Hilaire Belloc. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

A Spiritual Æneid, by Ronald Knox. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

An Awakening and What Came of It, by James Kent Stone. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Beyond the Road to Rome, by Georgina P. Curtis. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.

Apologia pro Vita Sua, by John Henry Cardinal Newman. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Confessions of a Convert, by Mgr. Hugh Benson. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Roads to Rome. With an introduction by Cardinal Vaughan. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Back to Holy Church, by Von Ruville. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Roads to Rome, by G. Raupert. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.

MORE TECHNICAL WORKS.

Sur les Ordinations Anglicanes, by A. Boudinhon, Paris, 1894.

The Bull on Anglican Orders, by S. F. Smith, S.J., London, 1897.

Nouvelle Théologie Dogmatique, by J. Souben, vol. viii., pp. 77, *et seq.,* Paris, 1905.

Anglican Ordinations: Theology of Rome and Canterbury in a Nutshell, by H. C. Semple, S.J., New York, 1906.

THE LIBRARY OF THE
OCT 20 1929
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The Catholic World

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC MONTHLY

ESTABLISHED IN 1865

A Magazine for Clergy and Laity

¶Every Catholic should know the great social and religious problems of reconstruction.

¶*The Catholic World* covers these problems: states the principles that guide in their solution.

¶Endorsed by the Holy Father.

¶Recommended by the American Hierarchy.

Subscription price, $4.00 a year.
Single copies, 40 cents.
Sample Copy Sent on Request

THE CATHOLIC WORLD
120 West 60th Street
New York City

51